

The National Republican

Daily (except Sunday) and Weekly,
BY THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN COMPANY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Our DAILY is served to subscribers by carrier
per Fifty Cents a month.
By mail, postage prepaid, one year \$6.00
Two months \$1.00
One month \$0.50

Payable invariably in advance.

For the benefit of subscribers and by mail,
\$1.00 per year, in arrears.

The Weekly, with all the news of the country,
of all sorts obtained, when possible,
for subscribers without charge upon application.

Published monthly, cannot be returned.

Remittances other than by post money or
express, or by mail, always at sender's risk.

No receipt for subscriptions returned.

On the reverse when subscription expires.

THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CO.,
C. W. FOX, President.

Entered at the Post-office at Washington, D. C.,
second-class matter.

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1855.

AMUSEMENTS.

ALBRIGHT'S OPERA HOUSE.—"Siba."
FORD'S OPERA-HOUSE.—Mr. Thos. Boucicault.
HERZOG'S MUSEUM.—Our Surprise Party.
PIKE MUSEUM.—"Tal, a Wild Child," etc.
THEATER COURSE.—"Flora."

The reorganized Critic makes a good
start under the new management.

The part taken by Mexico in restoring
rights to the Central American states is
altogether creditable to our sister re-
public.

PATRONIZE home merchants and me-
chanics if you wish to advance the income
and value of your investments in real
estate in Washington.

It is not at all strange that several
members of the Illinois legislature have
died recently. That distinguished body
has failed to demonstrate the utility of
living.

LITTLE Delaware has undertaken a
big job in resolving to prohibit non-
residents from fishing in Delaware river
and bay. It is not only a big but a
swinish undertaking.

INGRATITUDE, the meanest of all
vices, shows up in its meanest shape
when administration organs refer to the
"Independent Republican" contingent
of their party as Mozzumps.

FROM every part of the country come
expressions of incredulity as to the alleged
attempt to assassinate Gov. Headly. The
report is universally regarded as a ruse to
rescue the governor's name from the clos-
ing waves of oblivion.

A PRESIDENT who owes his election to
Democratic solidarity, secured and main-
tained by wholesale and retail murder of
negroes, should not take too much to heart
such violent utterances as those which
appeared some months ago in an organ of
the colored people published in this city.

"It is wonderful," says a New York
World's special, "to hear the Republicans
who come to Washington praise the new
administration." It strikes us as no
less wonderful to hear troops of Democ-
rats curse the administration as they
depart empty-handed from the national
capital.

In order to pacify those Virginians
who are dissatisfied with the appoint-
ment of Mr. Kelley to be minister to the
court of King Humbert, THE REPUBLICAN
will state that, according to the
general understanding in Washington,
Mr. Kelley owes his appointment to the
united endorsement of a distinguished
priate and an eminent attorney—Arch-
bishop Gibbons and Hon. R. T. Merrick.

THE RIGHTS of married women are
strongly enforced by a decision of the
Supreme Court rendered yesterday in a
District of Columbia case. The court
holds that the separate estate of a wife
cannot be held for debts contracted by
the husband, even for rent of home and
household supplies; that unless the wife
is a party to the contract no agreement
by the husband, signing himself as trustee,
is binding on her.

THE REPUBLICAN has been more tire-
lessly energetic than any of its esteemed
contemporaries in the thankless work of
trying to trace the Mugwump to its
origin. We may be permitted to say,
with pardonable pride, that in our ex-
haustive zoological researches we have
had the voluntary co-operation of such
learned naturalists as Phineas T. Barnum
and Adam Forepaugh. But, remarkable
as have been our achievements in this
scientific labor, we are not so puffed up
with vanity that we cannot extend a gen-
eral welcome to any fellow-scientist who
desires to co-operate with us for the
general good. Such a collaborator contributes
the following verses to the New York Sun
and hopes they may throw some light
upon the true meaning of the word mug-
wump. He says the names used for birds
or bats are not found in the dictionary;
but Judge Bennett says they are all to
be found in the swamps of eastern North
Carolina:

The Mugwump roosts in the hollow log,
The sag-wings sit in the tree;
Whenever I hear the hawg sing
My heart is sad in me.

Whenever the snap-tan toots his toot
To the wall of the mewping hem,
And the mink-munk chimes in the stilly night,
You bet I'm lonely then.

It is confidently expected that Mr.
George William Curtis will soon bring
out his promised pamphlet on this branch
of natural history, and it would not be
surprising if the original Mugwump
proved, after all, to be an inhabitant of
the treary lowlands of North Carolina,
nesting in hollow logs.

Twenty-four years ago Ulysses S.
Grant, an ex-captain of the United States
Army, was a very quiet citizen of Galena,
where he kept a leather-store. He had
taken little interest in politics, his only
vote for president having been cast for
James Buchanan in 1856. On the 19th of
April, 1861, U. S. Grant wrote a private
letter to his wife's father, Mr. Frederick
Dent, of St. Louis, which has just been
printed for the first time. It contains many
of very great interest in connection with the
author's subsequent career. After a few
words of introduction the writer says:

"The dials are indeed startling, but now
'tis the time, particularly in the border
states, for men to prove their love of
country. I know it is hard for me to
sparely work with the Republican
party, but now all party distinctions
should be lost sight of, and every true
patriot for maintaining the integrity
of the glorious old stars and stripes, the
constitution, and the Union." His confi-
dence in the strength of the government
was shown by the statement: "I tell you
there is no mistaking the feelings of the
people. The government can call into

the field not only 75,000 troops, but ten
or twenty times 75,000 if it should be
necessary, and find the means of main-
taining them, too." Further on he says:
"In all this I can but see the doom of
slavery. The north does not want, nor
will they want, to interfere with the in-
stitution, but they will refuse for all time
to give it protection, unless the south
shall return soon to their allegiance. As
THE REPUBLICAN stated recently, when
calling attention to certain official docu-
ments "clearing up the record" of 1862,
the more closely Grant's record is in-
spected the more grandly the im-
plications of the laws in this particu-
lar case.

Between the Devil and the Deep Sea.

Mr. Phelps, the new minister to Eng-
land, is rather late and appears very awk-
ward in attempting, even in qualified
phrases, to deny the authentic character
of his famous anti-war speech of 1861.

It was taken down at the time by a
stenographer; was printed first, he be-
lieves, in the *Herald*, just after-
ward in all the Republican papers of
Vermont. It would, doubtless, have been
more widely published, except that Mr.
Phelps was an unknown man beyond his
state, as indeed he continued practically
to the time of his appointment. More-
over, "cooperated" speeches were so com-
mon that year that Mr. Phelps was only
keeping himself abreast of the treacherous
gang whose frankest exponent was Brick
Pomeroy and whose most respectable
representative in New England was
Thomas H. Seymour, of Connecticut.

Mr. Phelps, instead of denying his speech
at the time, just as it was published
and republished under his very nose in
Burlington, chose rather to glory in it,
according to contemporary evidence.

Sixteen years later, in 1880, Mr. Phelps
was the Democratic candidate for gov-
ernor of Vermont. Again the famous
anti-war speech, with all its slurs on
Abraham Lincoln, and all its abuse of
the Union soldiers, all its "cooperated"
venom, was produced and reproduced,
and again Mr. Phelps and all his party
organs, by silent acquiescence and occa-
sionally by defense of its sentiments,
fully acknowledged not only its genuin-
ess, but its lurid correctness.

We submit, therefore, that Mr. Phelps's
qualified denial comes too late.

In a court of justice he would not be
permitted to put in a denial after twenty
years of acquiescence in its truth, especially
when, for the first time, he has a strong
interest in disavowing it.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.

Mr. Phelps has made one plea that
might have some merit, but has since
been disposed out of his own mouth and
from his own pen. He argues that he
could not have used such coarse phrases
as quoted in the speech of 1861. But just
as we are disposed to credit him at least
with repentance on that plea there is
published a letter he wrote only two
years ago to Mr. Stewart, a Republican
member of Congress from Vermont. It
is intended to be humorous, but it is only
vulgar. The same coarse tone, the same
credulity to everything bad among his
opponents is visible in this letter as in
the distinguished the famous "cooperated"
speech of 1861.